

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**08/899,856**

Applicant(s)  
**Blumberg et al.**

Examiner  
**Thomas Cunningham**

Group Art Unit  
**1644**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thomas Cunningham

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Ed Gates

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Sep 28, 1999

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 18-59

Identification of prior art discussed:

Simister et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph are withdrawn and the claim language is interpreted as encompassing conjugates of an "FcRn binding partner" (e.g. an Fc segment of IgG). It was agreed that the claimed methods do not encompass methods of administering native unconjugated immunoglobulin molecules per se (such as Ig's in colostrum), see statement on page 3 of Paper No. 14. It was also agreed that the claimed methods are limited to those resulting in transepithelial delivery of a drug or an antigen for therapeutic purposes and do not read on methods of administration of antibody conjugates for the purposes of treatment of diseases on the luminal side of an epithelial barrier, e.g. intestinal infections or tumors exposed within the mouth or stomach. The Examiner agreed that administration of a conjugate to the lungs might be expected to result in binding of the recited conjugates to Fc receptors on cells like pulmonary macrophages, but that such exposure would not be expected to result in transepithelial delivery of the intact conjugate.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☒ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.